

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PRAKASH MELWANI,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-1329RSM

ORDER DENYING SECOND  
STIPULATED MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' second "Stipulated Protective Order," Dkt. #80, based again on the Court's model protective order. The Court finds that the proposed protective order does not conform to the requirement that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as stated by Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled "Confidential Material," the model protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" This second proposed protective order is far better than the first at listing specific documents, however it continues to include certain categories that are far too broad, specifically: "the Designating Party's own commercially sensitive information, such as (a) financial or accounting information; (b)

1 commercially sensitive internal communications or information; and (c) business negotiations,  
2 transactions, and dealings with Non-Parties.” Dkt. #80 at 2–3. “Commercially sensitive internal  
3 communications or information” is essentially the same as “sensitive business material,”  
4 something the parties were explicitly instructed not to include. Financial information, accounting  
5 information, and business dealing with non-parties are not entitled to confidential treatment  
6 without some further basis. The Court does not want to waste time denying motions to seal a  
7 wide variety of standard business documents.  
8

9 The parties submit no argument to justify this departure from the model protective order’s  
10 guidelines. Accordingly, this Motion will be denied.

11 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby  
12 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ second Model Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #80, is  
13 DENIED.

14 DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2023.  
15  
16

17 

18 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27